

when you are beyond the shores and your family is back here in the United States. That pay raise means the difference in their quality of life. I cannot tell you the emotional stress on a military person, separated from his or her family, beyond the seas, when they hear that pay raise could well be in jeopardy should this body, this afternoon or tomorrow, not pass this legislation. We owe a duty to those who volunteer to see that they are adequately compensated. I hope we will do that.

In addition, this conference report adds almost \$1 billion over the budget request to provide defenses for our troops and our Nation against the very real threat that is in the R&D report, the real threat, particularly to forward-deployed troops, against missile attack. Those of us who visited the gulf operations during the gulf war saw firsthand the damage by the crudest type of ballistic missile, the Scud missile, that Saddam Hussein relentlessly fired upon our troops and those of our allies, and relentlessly fired upon Tel Aviv. Many of us here saw firsthand the devastation of those crude weapons.

We had in place our best defense at that time, barely off the drawing boards, barely off the production lines. We have an obligation to the men and women of the Armed Forces and, indeed, to all of our citizens and others deployed abroad to put our greatest strength of research and development into deterring these systems in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, may I inquire of the Chair what the regular order is? Are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business with Senators permitted to speak for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent, then, to proceed for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TERRORISM

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I wish to talk a little bit today about an issue which is on everyone's mind in America, which is the question of terrorism. I spoke briefly yesterday on this matter, but I wanted to expand on those comments because there is a great deal happening within this body and the other body and in the Government generally on how we react to this new world, which has brought this threat to us with such immediacy, as we see in Atlanta, as we see in flight 800. I think it is important to review what is happening here in the Federal response to it, where we should go from here, and also to talk a little bit about other areas that need to be addressed.

First off, the scope of the problem, I think, cannot be overestimated. The immediacy of the problem cannot be

overstated. The fact is, we have stepped out of the cold war into a very hot war, and it is a hot war that involves people who have targeted Americans and American institutions with the intention of bringing physical harm to those institutions and to our citizens.

We should not be naive about this. We are a nation which has some wonderful characteristics. One of the great characteristics of our Nation is that we always believe in the best in people. We always give people the benefit of the doubt. We are an optimistic and upbeat country. It is our nature to think positively, not only about ourselves but about our neighbors throughout the world. That is a wonderful characteristic, and, hopefully, nothing will ever cause us to lose that better nature which makes up the American personality. But it is time, also, for us to be realistic. There are evil people out there. Unfortunately, there are also governments out there which fund, support, and endorse those evil individuals. There are people out there whose intention it is to kill Americans, to destroy American institutions simply because we are Americans.

Some of this terrorist threat is obviously domestic. But the domestic threat is a manageable threat. It is a containable threat, and it is one which I believe our institutions are well structured to address already. The FBI and the various State agencies which do law enforcement are well-tooled and well-experienced in how to address, to meet, to obtain intelligence on and to respond to, domestic terrorism and acts of violence. We, as a nation, have had this happen in the past.

I remember in the 1960's we had a group called the Weathermen, in New York. We have been able to respond. I do not have any question in my mind but that we will find the perpetrator of the bombing in Atlanta and we will prosecute that person, and we will do likewise relative to Oklahoma in the prosecution area and obtain a conviction, hopefully, if that is what the jury finds appropriate.

So, domestic terrorism is a very severe problem, but it is not the core threat that we face as a nation. The core threat that we face as a nation is internationally sponsored terrorist acts, because here you have individuals who are backed up by governments or by institutions or large groups of people who have the physical and economic capacity to wreak incredible harm on our country and our citizens. This international terrorism is a new breed of threat. It is something we as a country have not faced before.

As a result, we need to take a new look from a different view of how we approach the prevention, anticipation, and, hopefully, termination of this threat.

It was reported in the press today that there are actually functions camps in Iran that may have as many as 5,000 individuals who are specifically

being trained for the purposes of executing terrorist acts, killing of Americans, killing of people from other cultures around this world that these fanatics, these criminals disagree with.

Now, whether that report is accurate, I do not know, but it is legitimate enough to have been put on the wire by a reasonable news source, and it is clearly reflective of the concern which we, as a nation, must be ready to address.

So, how do we address it? How do we address this new international threat, this new cold war which is now a hot war for us?

I think we have to begin by recognizing that as of right now, the Federal Government is not ready to address it. We have to acknowledge our weakness in this area. We have very good people at the heads of the agencies which are charged with the responsibility for anticipating and developing a response to international terrorism directed at the United States.

There are four primary agencies involved: the State Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Department, and the Justice Department. There are also a lot of ancillary agencies that have a role in this—the Treasury Department, for example—but the four primary agencies are headed by good people, in my opinion, and they are all committed to doing something on this issue.

But the problem is that there isn't a comprehensive, systematic plan in place. There are, on paper, some systematic plans. For example, the National Security Council is, by law, charged very appropriately with the responsibility of organizing, orchestrating, anticipating the threat of terrorism and the response to the threat of terrorism. But it doesn't really do it in practice. In practice, it does very little, actually.

If you talk to each of the heads of the different Departments in charge here, they will tell you of their sincere interest in pursuing this and what their Department is doing. You can ask them, "How are you interfacing with the other Department?" And they say, "Well, we're occasionally speaking on this point and speaking occasionally on this point," and it is almost always a personal-relationship-type exchange. There is no system in place, no management structure in place, no comprehensive plan in place which directs the response to the international terrorist threat. That has to be changed.

Now, in a bill that was reported out of the Appropriations Committee yesterday, the Commerce, State, Justice bill, which is the subcommittee I chair, we put in place a series of new initiatives in the area of fighting terrorism. Not new in some instances; in some instances, they were supportive of initiatives which were already in place. But the most important part of this proposal was that we have developed by the Attorney General a comprehensive plan which will be reported back to the

Congress by November 15 and which will outline how we are going to get these different agencies to work together.

I don't know if this proposal is going to go anywhere, because that bill, which subcommittee I happen to chair, is sort of at the end of the trail here as we move down the appropriations path, and it may not even get up until the end of September. As a practical matter, we really shouldn't have to have a law passed to tell the administration to do this. As a practical matter—and I don't say this to be derogatory because I don't intend to be, I hope it is constructive—as a practical matter, the President should meet with the Secretary of State, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Attorney General, and the Defense Secretary and require them to develop such a plan. And those meetings should continue on a regular basis with the heads of those agencies over a series of weeks and months until that plan is not only developed but being executed.

As a practical matter, we are not going to accomplish the goal of putting in place a systematic response from the Federal Government to the threat of international terrorism until we have the President of the United States driving his Department heads to accomplish just that in an organized way.

Having served as a chief executive at a State level—and it doesn't really work much differently at the Federal level; in fact, it probably is even worse at the Federal level as far as getting coordination going—I know from experience that unless the chief executive physically participates and demands a physical participation of the key department heads, then issues like this then get lost either, one, to inattention, or, more significantly and more often is the case, get undermined by the battles over turf.

An equally important initiative to having the President drive this process with his Department heads is that there must be put in place a system which accomplishes the follow-on followup that is necessary to produce results so that it doesn't depend on individuals in the end, but it is functioning as an element of an organized plan which can be executed by people no matter who is sitting in the key seats around the table. Unfortunately, none of that has occurred to date. I hope that it will occur soon.

In the meetings that have been going on this week on the special task force on terrorism that was set up where Members of the Senate, Members of the House, and the White House were meeting, along with the Justice Department, it was suggested we have a blue ribbon panel. I believe the House today will appoint a blue ribbon panel.

Now, I like blue ribbon panels as well as the next person, and I am sure a blue ribbon panel could be useful here to some degree, but the lead time for such a group is considerable, and we don't have to wait to get things start-

ed, to hear back from a commission, as good as it may be and as constructive as it may be.

There is a tremendous amount of coordination and planning that can begin now. It is not occurring now. There is a lot of planning and effort going on right now, I don't want to underestimate that. These Departments individually are doing a superior job in trying to get up to speed in their area of responsibility. But so often, the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing, and the left hand doesn't tell the left foot what it is doing, and the left foot doesn't tell the right foot what it is doing, and we all end up in different directions, and we end up in a pretzel-like position. And that is, unfortunately, what is occurring, to some degree, to our response of the overall issue of a comprehensive initiative.

So, yes, let's go forward with a blue ribbon commission, because I think it would be helpful to get outside review from people who are very knowledgeable on terrorism as to how to proceed. And yes, let's keep the energies going in the FBI, and the CIA, and in the State Department and in the Defense Department on various actions in their bailiwicks that can be taken to try to get their responsibilities in terrorism response proceeding effectively.

But at the same time, we need to have this comprehensive approach coming from the top, from the President, through the Secretariats, to the departments so that we have an integrated, cooperative effort and one that is focused. That is the most critical thing we need to do right now to address the international terrorist threat, which is huge and extraordinarily dangerous.

In addition to this comprehensive plan, within the bill that was passed out of the Appropriations Committee, we basically took five other steps, five other philosophical steps—or not philosophical because I think they are very tangible steps—steps to try to beef up the effort in fighting terrorists.

First off, we have given significantly more resources to the FBI to help it monitor terrorist groups in the United States and overseas. Obviously, the best way to stop a terrorist attack on the United States is to know when it is going to come and who is going to pursue it. But to do that, you have to have people. You have to have intelligence-gathering. Unfortunately, the intelligence-gathering capability by human beings, which is the way you really have to do it in this area of terrorism, has been significantly reduced, especially at the CIA.

However, the FBI, which our committee has jurisdiction over, is attempting to reach out to police forces around the world in order to use the resources of the police forces in various countries where terrorist groups may be organizing and to take advantage of their knowledge base, which is extraordinary, and thus multiply by hundreds if not thousands and actually tens of

thousands their ability to obtain information.

The FBI is attempting to expand that pool of information-gathering by moving agents into international posts. In this bill we propose to strongly support that initiative so that we can begin to better anticipate who and where the threat is coming from.

It is an interesting thing. I met with President Mubarak yesterday, or Wednesday. There is a man who obviously understands and knows the threat of terrorism. One of his biggest concerns—and I would put it down almost as a gripe, and it is a legitimate one. Maybe I should not use the word "gripe" because it is a very legitimate frustration. His biggest frustration is that it is our democratic allies in Europe who have become the prime harborers of some of the most vicious murderers and terrorists.

He points to England and to some of the European Continent countries as being nations which, for whatever reason, have decided to allow to live within their shores people who are known to have an intention of committing terrorist acts and who have a stated policy of doing so relative not only to Egypt and to other modern Arab states, but relative to America.

So we are not talking about access to information in nations which maybe we have trouble dealing with. We are talking about getting access to information in nations who are our allies and maybe working with those allies to be a little more responsible in the manner in which they deal with individuals whom they have allowed into their countries and who may represent threats to our country.

The third issue which we attempted to increase the effort here in our bill is to create a better capacity for response, both at the Federal level and at the State and local level, to a terrorist event. In this area we are very concerned about terrorist events that might involve biological or chemical threats. So that is something we really need to focus in on.

This committee is trying to do that. We have created rapid response teams or increased the funding—they already exist—but increase the funding to allow us to have more capacity to move rapid response teams into positions where there is a local emergency.

In addition, we have significantly increased the effort to break down communication barriers between the Federal Government and the State governments and the local governments. Once again, you have this unfortunate atmosphere which develops amongst bureaucracies, whether they are law enforcement bureaucracies or social services bureaucracies, that is known as turf.

I remember when I was Governor of New Hampshire, one of my great frustrations was that we could not get the State police and the local police to even be on the same radio band so if a State police officer wanted to talk to a

local police officer while they were chasing a car at a high speed, they basically had to call in to headquarters and have the headquarters call out to the other police car. They could not talk to each other. It was a turf issue.

Unfortunately, that gets magnified hundreds and hundreds of times in innumerable circumstances. What we are trying to do is break down those barriers of communication so that we will have better communication between Federal, State, and local law enforcement on a two-way-street effort for information.

Fifth, we have attempted to increase the technological information and capability of the FBI. This is very important. We all know that we are dealing in a technological world and there are in the area of communications, in the area of detection, in the area of crime prevention, huge technological advances being made, and we have to stay current. So we are going to significantly increase that effort.

Sixth, it is our desire to make sure that our key facilities in the law enforcement and international community, international stage, are protected. So we have increased the funding for security at our courthouses, and, very important in my mind, we have increased the funding for security for our personnel who are serving overseas in our State Department.

I cannot and will not tolerate—and I do not think anybody in this body would tolerate—putting American citizens who are working for our Government in a post that has a fair amount of risk to it at an unnecessary risk. There are simple things that need to be done to help these people and protect their security and, equally important, protect their family security.

There is no reason why an American who is working for the State Department who has his or her family with him or her should feel that that family is not getting adequate protection from our Government if there is a threat occurring in that country to Americans. So we needed to increase that security effort. And we have done that.

So this bill, this State-Commerce-Justice bill, is a major step, in my opinion, but not a final step, hardly even a midway step really. It is just a part of the beginning steps, but a major thrust in the beginning steps toward getting together our counterterrorism effort. But as I mentioned earlier, it all depends to a great extent on the capacity of the administration to pull together these various agencies. And that has to start at the top.

Also in this bill were two pieces of language—three actually—that have been passed by the Senate relative to terrorism in order to give our police and law enforcement community more flexibility and more capability, which passed this body by 90 to 0. They were a multipoint wiretapping and another wiretapping right and also a study on taggants relative to tracing explosives

and the institution of that. That language is also in this bill.

So it is a bill that has a lot of activity in the area of trying to address the terrorist threat. Specifically, the international terrorist threat is, I mentioned, the true concern, should be our true concern, in the area of trying to get ahead of this wave of potential violence directed at the United States. Now, on that score, the Government cannot do everything. The Government has never been able to do everything, in my opinion. It certainly cannot do everything in this arena. It is the primary player. The agencies which we have responsibility for have been described as the Defense Department in this area of counterterrorism. But there still has to be a responsibility among the communities of our citizenship. There still has to be a responsibility in our corporate community.

On that point, I have written, along with some of my colleagues who wish to join me, a letter to the companies who manage Internet access. As I mentioned yesterday, we all recognize that the Internet is the Wild West of information. I, for one, have absolutely no interest in regulating it. I think it would be a mistake. I think it would undermine the great potential of the new medium of education.

The fact is certain people are abusing the Internet. When you punch in the word “explosive” and trace that word on the Internet, you come up with something like 32,000 designations, of which 6,000—6,000—involve directions on how to make an explosive device, directions titled, such as, “How to make a pipe bomb and leave it at your favorite airport or Federal office building.” That is wrong.

What I have suggested in writing the leaders of these various entrepreneurial groups who are driving the economy of information, the information economy which is doing so much for our country, what I suggest to them, maybe it is time they gave a little thought here as to what type of access they are affording people relative to the Internet. Maybe they should create some sort of self-policing mechanism which says if something is clearly, clearly, on the Net for the purpose of explaining how to kill people, such as making a pipe bomb and leaving it at your favorite airport or Federal office building, that accessing that information should not be easy. It should not just involve typing in the word “explosive.”

When they index these items, maybe they decide not to index some items, recognizing that is a type of censorship they may not want to participate in. In this instance, it may be appropriate. In any event, when they index these systems, whether it is Yahoo, Magellan, or Netscape, generally, or America Online or CompuServe or some Microsoft system, they ought to make it more difficult to get that type of information, that you ought to go through more hoops before you can access. Granted,

that might not stop the truly committed individual, but it will certainly make it more difficult for the casual pursuer of this information. That is why I am sending this letter.

I am not sure what processes could be put in place. I think there ought to be some thought given. It should not come from the Government—in other words, the Government saying, “You do this,” as managers of the Internet, as people who create the access systems for the Internet. That will lead to all sorts of, in my opinion, more significant issues of freedom of speech and officiousness of Government.

This should be a self-policing exercise. These folks should have the common sense and the civic attitude to proceed to try to develop something. These are creative and imaginative people that have come up with these systems. If put in a room, I suspect they could come up with creative and imaginative solutions to this problem.

That is a brief summary—not that brief, actually—but a summary of where we stand in the counterterrorism exercise relative to the FBI, especially, but it is my concern relative to this administration and how it should pursue it and the Internet, and how it should be addressed in that arena.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I have sought recognition to discuss briefly one of the aspects of the immigration conference report which will come before the Senate either today or shortly after we return from recess. I think that it is very important that we reform our laws to provide increased resources to protect our borders and combat illegal immigration.

Nevertheless, I have been very much concerned about a number of provisions of the immigration bill. The provision which concerns me the most is the so-called Gallegly amendment, which would give the States the option to limit education opportunities to children of illegal immigrants. In my opinion, it is unthinkable in America to deny education to any children, regardless of their status, whether their parents are illegal immigrants.

That is something I feel particularly strongly about because both of my parents were immigrants. My mother came to this country as a child of 5 with her parents from a small town on the Russian-Polish border. My father came from Ukraine Russia, literally walked across Europe with barely a ruble in his pocket, sailed steerage—the bottom of the boat—to come to America to make a better life for himself. He did not know at the time he had a return trip ticket to France, not to Paris but to the Argonne Forest, where he fought in World War I as a buck private, to make the world safe